

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/763,966	01/23/2004	Darrell A. Poirier	006-110-301	7900	
20433 BLODGETT E	7590 09/04/2007 BLODGETT		EXAMINER		
43 HIGHLAN	D STREET	CHAWAN, VIJAY B			
WORCESTER, MA 016092797			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2626		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.		Applicant(s)			
		10/763,966		POIRIER, DARRELL A.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Vijay B. Cha	awan	2626			
The MAILING DATE of th Period for Reply	is communication app	,		correspondence ad	ldress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM Extensions of time may be available under after SIX (8) MONTHS from the mailing dealer of the specified above, the second of the second	OM THE MAILING DA the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 the of this communication. the maximum statutory period w period for reply will, by statute, three months after the mailing	ATE OF THI 36(a). In no even will apply and will cause the applic	S COMMUNICATION t, however, may a reply be tin expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this co			
Status							
 Responsive to communic This action is FINAL. Since this application is ir closed in accordance with 	2b)⊠ This condition for allowar	action is no	or formal matters, pro		e merits is		
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5) Claim(s) is/are allo 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejec 7) Claim(s) is/are obj 8) Claim(s) are subje	is/are withdrav wed. ted. ected to.	wn from cons					
Application Papers	•						
9) The specification is object 10) The drawing(s) filed on Applicant may not request the Replacement drawing sheet 11) The oath or declaration is	is/are: a) acce nat any objection to the of (s) including the correction	epted or b) drawing(s) be tion is required	held in abeyance. See if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CF			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawl 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (Paper No(s)/Mail Date	ng Review (PTO-948)		Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do Notice of Informal F Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/763,966 Page 2

Art Unit: 2626

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Claims 4 and 5 recites the limitation "a process as described in claim 1" in line 1.

 There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Inconsistencies such as these are pervasive throughout the claim language and need to be addressed
- 4. Claims 1-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: how the optimal voice recognition dictation is accomplished.
- 5. Claims 1-21 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

Page 3

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 7. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kahn et al., (US 2002/0095290 A1).

As per claim 1, Kahn et al., teach a computer system containing a central processing unit, cache memory, main memory, disk drive, USB port, analog to digital converter, a graphic controller, a graphic display, keyboard, mouse, a microphone, an operating system, and voice recognition software with user speaker files (Voice Model) that has been specifically measured using combined "Reliable Accuracy and Performance" (system responsiveness) metric for the purposes of providing optimal voice recognition dictation or conversational speech voice dictation (0019-0022).

As per claim 2, Kahn et al., teach a software application with claim 1 called RAP meter measuring voice recognition accuracy and system responsiveness on a computer system as described in claim 1 (0019-0022).

As per claim 3, Kahn et al., teach a software application with claim that provides a user interface to operate the software, provides log files, and certificates indicating system accuracy and performance results (0019-0022).

Application/Control Number: 10/763,966

Art Unit: 2626

As per claim 4, Kahn et al., teach a software application with claim 2 for the purposes of engineering development of optimal voice recognition system for use with voice recognition dictation or conversational speech (0019-0022).

As per claim 5, Kahn et al., teach a process in accordance with claim 2 for the purposes of manufacturing an optimal voice recognition system for use with voice recognition dictation or conversational speech (0019-0022).

As per claim 6, Kahn et al., teach a system as described in claim 1 that includes optimal user voice model(s) created from the voice recognition software through the voice recognition training or enrollment process and verified with the RAP Rate performance metric (0019-0022).

As per claim 7, Kahn et al., teach a software application installed on a computer system as described in claim 1 used for the purposes of transferring the user voice model to and from a transfer medium (0019-0022).

As per claim 8, Kahn et al., teach a software application installed on a computer system as described in claim 7 that includes a user interface with controls for transferring voice models (0019-0022).

As per teach 9, Kahn et al., teach a software application installed on a computer system as described in claim 7 named Voice Model Mobility that provides moving voice recognition user voice models between voice recognition system using transfer mediums of removable disk, writable CDs, networks, memory storage devices and credit card type magnetic strips (0019-0022).

Application/Control Number: 10/763,966

Art Unit: 2626

As per claim 10, Kahn et al., teach a software application installed on a computer system as described in claim 1 that creates a synthetic voice for the purposes of avoiding a speaker dependent voice recognition dictation system (0019-0022).

As per claim 11, Kahn et al., teach a software application installed on a computer system as described in claim 10 named Super Voice Model that contains a library of voice models, a voice model cataloging and classification table, logic to quickly sample voice input from users, and the logic to create a synthetic voice model (0019-0022).

As per claim 12; Kahn et al., teach a software application installed on a computer system as described in claim 11, that has the ability to move synthetic voice models between voice recognition systems (0019-0022).

As per claim 13, Kahn et al., teach a synthetic voice file (Voice Model) for the purposes of training a voice recognition dictation system as described in claim 1 (0019-0022).

As per claim 14, Kahn et al., teach a specific cable configuration that can be simultaneously connected to a handheld transcriber (analog or digital recorder) and a voice recognition system (0019-0022).

As per claim 15, Kahn et al., teach a voice training/enrollment process for simultaneous training of a voice recognition system as described in claim 1 and handheld recording device (0019-0022).

As per claim 16, Kahn et al., teach a voice recognition dictation system as described in claim 1 that is in the form factor of a handheld voice recognition dictation

Art Unit: 2626

transcriber that includes operating system and voice recognition software as part of the handheld device (0019-0022).

Claims 17-21 are rejected using similar rationale as previous claims. They are rambling in nature, contain inconsistencies and are not clear in claiming the subject matter.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached form PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vijay B. Chawan whose telephone number is (571) 272-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Friday 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vijay B. Chawan Primary Examiner Art Unit 2626

vbc 8/30/07 VIJAY CHAWAN PRIMARY EXAMINER